

1 S. BRENT VOGEL  
Nevada Bar No. 6858  
2 [Brent.Vogel@lewisbrisbois.com](mailto:Brent.Vogel@lewisbrisbois.com)  
KATHERINE J. GORDON  
3 Nevada Bar No. 5813  
[Katherine.Gordon@lewisbrisbois.com](mailto:Katherine.Gordon@lewisbrisbois.com)  
4 LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP  
6385 South Rainbow Boulevard, Suite 600  
5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89118  
T: 702.893.3383  
6 F: 702.893.3789  
*Attorneys for Defendant Allan Kirkwood, D.D.S.*

7  
8  
9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
10 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

11 LUIS CERVANTES,  
12 Plaintiff,  
13 vs.  
14 EDDIE SCOTT, *et al.*,  
15 Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:17-cv-00562-MMD-DJA

**STIPULATION AND ORDER TO  
EXTEND DISPOSITIVE MOTION  
DEADLINE (Second Request)**

16  
17 Pursuant to LR 6-1 and LR 26-4, Plaintiff Luis Cervantes (“Plaintiff”), Defendant Allan  
18 Kirkwood, D.D.S. (“Dr. Kirkwood”), and Defendants Eddie Scott, Kevin Patimeteepom, and  
19 Timothy Dorion (“the LVMPD Defendants”) by and through their respective counsel, hereby  
20 stipulate, agree, and request that this Court extend the dispositive motion deadline from the current  
21 date of April 9, 2020 because Plaintiff filed an Objection to the Magistrate Judge’s Order Denying  
22 Plaintiff’s Motion for Leave to File an Amended Complaint and Denying Plaintiff’s Motion to  
23 Extend the Discovery Deadlines. [ECF No. 73]. Defendant Dr. Kirkwood filed an Opposition to  
24 the Objection [ECF No. 74]. Plaintiff’s Reply is not yet due.

25 The parties previously stipulated to continue the due date for dispositive motions until 30  
26 days after the Court ruled on Plaintiff’s Motion for Leave to File an Amended Complaint and Motion  
27 to Extend the Discovery Deadlines, which resulted in a due date of April 9, 2020. However, the  
28 purpose for extending the due date to April 9, 2020 is now moot in light of Plaintiff’s Objection.

1 Therefore, the parties request a second extension of the due date for dispositive motions until 30  
2 following the Court's ruling on Plaintiff's Objection, which should provide a final resolution of the  
3 two Motions.

4 **A. Discovery Completed to Date**

5 Plaintiff, Dr. Kirkwood, and the LVMPD Defendants have exchanged initial disclosures  
6 pursuant to FRCP 26(f). Plaintiff provided first supplemental disclosures. The LVMPD Defendants  
7 provided first and second supplemental disclosures. Dr. Kirkwood and the LVMPD Defendants  
8 served first sets of written discovery requests on Plaintiff and Plaintiff responded. The LVMPD  
9 Defendants served second sets of written discovery requests on Plaintiff and Plaintiff responded.  
10 Dr. Kirkwood and the LVMPD Defendants served Initial Expert Disclosures. The deposition of  
11 Plaintiff was taken on August 26, 2019.

12 Discovery closed on January 27, 2020.

13 **B. Discovery Remaining to be Completed**

14 If Plaintiff's Objection to the Court's denial of his Motion for Leave to File an Amended  
15 Complaint (which seeks the addition of two new Defendants) [ECF No. 73] is granted and Plaintiff  
16 is permitted to file his proposed amended Complaint, all parties will need additional time to  
17 complete discovery. If Plaintiff's Objection to the Court's denial of his Motion for Leave to File an  
18 Amended Complaint is denied, no additional discovery will be completed.

19 **C. Reason for Request for Extension of Dispositive Motion Deadline**

20 The Court's Orders on Plaintiff's Objection to the Magistrate Judge's Order Denying  
21 Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to File an Amended Complaint and Denying Plaintiff's Motion to  
22 Extend the Discovery Deadlines. [ECF No. 73] may affect the deadline for dispositive motions.

23 **D. Proposed Extended Deadline for Dispositive Motions**

24 Accordingly, the parties respectfully request that this Court enter an order as follows:

25 (1) Dispositive Motions.

26 Dispositive motions may be filed no later than thirty (30) days after the Court files its Orders  
27 regarding Plaintiff's Objection to the Magistrate Judge's Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion for  
28 Leave to File an Amended Complaint and Denying Plaintiff's Motion to Extend the Discovery

1 Deadlines. [ECF No. 73].

2 The parties recognize that this request is not being made within twenty-one (21) days of the  
3 current dispositive motion deadline, April 9, 2020 pursuant to LR 26-4; however the parties submit  
4 that good cause and excusable neglect exists.

5 LR 26-4 states in relevant part:

6 A motion or stipulation to extend a deadline set forth in a  
7 discovery plan must be received by the court no later than 21  
8 days before the expiration of the subject deadline. A request  
9 made within 21 days of the subject deadline must be  
10 supported by a showing of good cause. A request made after  
11 the expiration of the subject deadline will not be granted  
12 unless the movant also demonstrates that the failure to act  
13 was the result of excusable neglect.

14 In evaluating excusable neglect, the court considers the following factors: (1) the reason for  
15 the delay and whether it was in the reasonable control of the moving party; (2) whether the moving  
16 party acted in good faith; (3) the length of the delay and its potential impact on the proceedings; and  
17 (4) the danger of prejudice to the nonmoving party. See *Pioneer Inv. Servs. Co. v. Brunswick*  
18 *Assocs.*, 507 U.S. 380, 395 S. Ct. 1489, 123 L.Ed.2d 74 (1993).

19 As set forth above, the parties are still unaware of the Court's ruling regarding a potential  
20 amendment of the Complaint (which would add two new Defendants) and its ruling regarding  
21 Plaintiff's requested extension of the current discovery deadlines. The Magistrate Judge denied both  
22 of Plaintiff's requests, however, Plaintiff filed an Objection to the Magistrate's Order. Should the  
23 Court grant Plaintiff's Objection regarding either the denial of Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to File  
24 an Amended Complaint or the denial of Plaintiff's Motion to Extend Discovery, the current  
25 dispositive motion deadline would be moved accordingly.

26 The parties have been diligent; however, they do not exercise control over the date upon  
27 which the Court will rule on the pending Objection. The parties are unable to determine their next  
28 steps in litigation, including the scope of potential dispositive motions, until such time as the Court

1 has ruled on the pending Objection. As such, the delay in requesting the current extension was  
2 outside the control of the parties. The length of the requested extension for dispositive motions  
3 should not result in prejudice to any party.

4 The foregoing request and stipulation for an extension of the dispositive motion deadline is  
5 made in good faith, jointly by the parties hereto.

7 LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP

KAEMPER CROWELL

9 /s/ Katherine J. Gordon

S. BRENT VOGEL

Nevada Bar No. 6858

KATHERINE J. GORDON

Nevada Bar No. 5813

6385 S. Rainbow Boulevard, Suite 600

Las Vegas, Nevada 89118

T: 702.893.3383

Attorneys for Defendant Allan Kirkwood, D.D.S.

9 /s/ Lyssa S. Anderson

LYSSA S. ANDERSON

Nevada Bar No. 5781

RYAN W. DANIELS

Nevada Bar No. 13094

1980 Festival Plaza Drive, Ste. 650

Las Vegas, Nevada 89135

T: 702.792.7000

Attorneys for Defendants Eddie Scott,  
Kevin Patimeteeporn, and Timothy Dorion

15 HATFIELD & ASSOCIATES

17 /s/ Trevor J. Hatfield

TREVOR J. HATFIELD

Nevada Bar No. 7373

703 S. Eighth Street

Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

T: 702.388.4469

Attorney for Plaintiff

22 **ORDER**

23 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

25   
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

27 Dated: April 9, 2020

28 Case No. 2:17-cv-0562-MMD-DJA